

Sept. 10.

SATURDAY DULLNESS.

Pervades Fish Market at T Wharf Today.

The receipts of fish at Boston today as expected are light, there being but five vessels at that port all of whom are shore fishermen.

This is the usual custom on Saturday, as the vessels do not come in last of the week, knowing that the market will be dull. Then most of the vessels have been in earlier in the week, so that there are not many to come.

The market today is weak, but next week will see it more buoyant, as the vessels will be somewhat delayed owing to a scarcity of bait, that is prevalent all along the coast.

The fares and prices in detail are:

Boston Arrivals.

Sch. Alcina, 20,000 cod.
Sch. Mary E. Cooney, 5000 haddock, 10,000 cod, 50,000 hake, 10,000 cusk, 1000 pollock.
Sch. Morning Star, 3000 pollock.
Sch. Nettie, 2000 pollock, 3 swordfish.
Sch. E. C. Hussey, 18,000 cod.
Haddock, \$2.10 per cwt.; large cod, \$3.50; market cod, no sales; hake, \$1.50 to \$2.50; cusk, \$1.75; pollock, \$2.50; swordfish, 17 cts. per lb.

PORT OF GLOUCESTER.

Coastwise Arrivals.

Sch. Fred O. Walker, Boston for Rockland.
Sch. Pearl Nelson, Boston for Rockland.
Sch. Clara B. Reynard, Boston for Millbridge.
Steamer Reliance, Boston for Rockport.

Vessels Sailed.

Sch. Gossip, dory handlining.
Sch. Emerald, shore.
Sch. Rita A. Victor, shore.
Sch. Edward A. Rich, shore.
Sch. Massasoit, shore.
Sch. Massachusetts, shacking.

Sept. 12.

SOME VESSELS HAD GOOD FARES

But Boston Receipts Light For a Monday.

Receipts of fish at Boston today are light for the opening day of the week for a small fleet have arrived at that port and prices have advanced several points over those of Saturday.

Cod fish is quoted at four to five cents and all other ground fish accordingly. Steamer Spray, out four days, is in today with a large trip of haddock, which is quoted at two and a half cents and the lowest in the catalogue.

Sch. Regnia has the banner fare, having over 100,000 pounds, while schs. Gladys and Nellie, John J. Fallon and Mary C. Santos are also among the leaders.

Five swordfishermen are in today and none of them have large catches, the largest being 30 fish, which are selling at 15 to 17 cents per pound.

The fares and prices in detail are:

Boston Arrivals

Sch. Quonnapowitt, 6000 haddock, 1500 hake.
Sch. Valentinna, 9000 pollock.
Sch. Frances V. Silva, 22,000 haddock, 10,000 cod, 5000 hake.
Sch. Regina, 53,000 haddock, 30,000 cod, 20,000 hake.
Steamer Spray, 51,000 haddock, 1000 cod, 1000 hake.
Sch. William A. Morse, 12,000 haddock, 8000 cod, 2000 hake.
Sch. Gladys and Nellie, 45,000 haddock, 2000 cod 5000 hake.
Sch. John J. Fallon 45,000 haddock, 2000 cod, 3000 hake.
Sch. Mary C. Santos, 25,000 haddock, 30,000 cod.

Sept. 12.

Sch. Olivia Sears, 9000 cod.
Sch. Marion, 4000 pollock.
Sch. Tecumseh, 20 swordfish.
Sch. George H. Lubee, 32 swordfish.
Sch. Edmund Black, 21 swordfish.
Sch. A. C. Newhall, 12 swordfish.
Sch. Bryda F., 40 bbls large fresh herring.
Haddock, \$2 per cwt.; large cod, \$5 to \$5.50; small cod, \$2.50 to \$3.50; hake, \$2.50 to \$3.50; pollock, \$2.50; swordfish, 15 to 17 cts per lb.

BESET BY WHALES

Exciting Experience of Lumber Schooner From Maine.

Capt. H. B. Trubock of the sch. Nancy Ann, from Maine with a cargo of pine lumber, said recently that his passage down the Atlantic coast was a perilous one, says the Washington Post.

"Just after we got well out of the Kennebec and started down the coast we encountered a big school of whales," said the skipper. "Many of them were over one hundred feet long. Our course lay right in the midst of them. When we hit the bunch one big fellow resented the intrusion by giving us a hard rub on the windward side. Over we tipped and shipped about 500 gallons of water. It was fully three minutes before the big fish left us.

"I thought we were goners. My little ship has very small holes to let deck water off. For a moment we kept going over further, but all hands rushed to the upper side, and we gradually righted. After this narrow escape I tried to bring the ship more to the southeast in order to get out of the danger, but the wind was coming strongly from the east and it was impossible to do so.

"The whales followed us all the way down the coast and gave us much trouble. Occasionally one of the monsters would squirt a volume of water in the air and swim directly into the path of the schooner, remaining there until we struck him. We were going at such a rapid rate that I expected this performance to stave in our bow.

"The large load of lumber in the ship's hold braced the sides to such an extent that it was not very easy to stave a hole in it. If it had not been for that I am confident the Nancy Ann would have been at the bottom by this time.

"When we arrived off the coast of New Jersey a heavy northeast wind struck us, and I had to change the course more to the southeast to keep from going ashore. For about twenty-four hours we headed out to sea and temporarily escaped the frolicsome whales. When we put back to shore, however, we ran into them again.

"This time a very large one swam up to the starboard side of the ship and gave us an awfully hard bump. We went over to port and dipped some water, but not as much as before.

"I have never seen so many whales together. There is evidently a scarcity of food about the North Atlantic, and they are coming south in search of it. I have often had them come up to the ship and swim alongside for hours, but have never seen them so full of fight.

"At times the water about us was worked up to a foam by their scrambling and fighting for a chance piece of food. I estimate that there were 200 whales in that school. When we turned in at Norfolk they continued down the coast."

Sept. 12.

FEW RECEIPTS AT THIS PORT.

But Many Vessels Out and Daily Expected.

The receipts of fish at this port today are confined to two fares of salt and fresh fish, sch. Conqueror from Quero Bank with 170,000 pounds of salt

Sept. 12.

and fresh fish and sch. William H. Moody from Georges with 30,000 pounds of salt cod, also a fare of 75,000 pounds of fresh mixed fish via Boston in sch. Flavilla and 150 barrels of bluebacks in steamer Jeffrey, and 1000 qtls. cured fish from Southwest Harbor, Me.

This is unusually small at this season and is somewhat unexpected for a large number of vessels are out and several due to arrive.

Bait is a great drawback to the fishermen for they have been unable to get a supply and so much valuable time has been lost, which prolonged their voyages.

Today's arrivals and receipts in detail are:

Today's Arrivals and Receipts.

Sch. Conqueror, Quero Bank, 100,000 lbs., fresh cod, 70,000 lbs. salt cod.
Sch. William H. Moody, Georges, 30,000 lbs. salt cod.
Sch. Flavilla, via Boston, 75,000 lbs. fresh mixed fish.
Steamer Jeffrey, seining 150 bbls. bluebacks.
Sch. Nelson Y. McFarland, Southwest Harbor, Me., 1000 qtls. cured fish.

Vessels Sailed.

Sch. Senator, halibuting.
Sch. Grace Darling, Boston.
Sch. Alice, Boston.
Sch. Harriett, haddocking.
Sch. Walter P. Goulart, haddocking.
Sch. Flora J. Sears, haddocking.
Sch. Maud F. Silva, haddocking.
Sch. Little Fannie, shore.
Sch. N. A. Rowe, shore.

Today's Fish Market.

Handline Georges cod, large, \$4 per cwt.; medium, \$3.50.
Trawl Georges cod, large, \$3.75 per cwt.; medium, \$3.25.
Trawl bank cod, large, \$3.35 per cwt.; medium, \$3.
Drift Georges cod, large, \$3.75 per cwt.; medium, \$3.50.
Outside sales of Bank cod, \$3.75 for large and \$3.50 for medium.
Salt cusk, large, \$2.50 per cwt.; medium, \$2.
Salt haddock, \$1.25 per cwt.
Salt hake, \$1.25 per cwt.
Salt pollock, \$1.25 per cwt.
Dory handline cod, large, \$3.75 per cwt.; medium, \$3.50.
Splitting prices for fresh fish:
Western cod, large, \$2.25 per cwt.; medium, \$1.75.
Eastern cod, large, \$1.90 per cwt.; medium, \$1.55; snappers, 60 cts.
Western Bank cod, large, \$2.12 1-2 per cwt.; medium, \$1.65.
Cusk, large, \$1.65 per cwt.; medium, \$1.25; snappers, 50 cents.
Haddock, \$1.10 per cwt.; hake, \$1.10 per cwt.; dressed pollock, 75 cts. per cwt.; round pollock, 70 cts. per cwt.

PORT OF GLOUCESTER.

Coastwise Arrivals.

British sch. Crescent, Economy, N. S., for Vineyard Haven.
British sch. Jennie C., Sackville, N. B., for orders.
British sch. Otis Miller, New York for Parrsboro, N. S.
Sch. W. W. Walker, Salem for Wells, Me.
Sch. Maggie Ellen, Port Reading, N. J.
Sch. Manton, Boston for Rockport.
United States revenue cutter Androscoggin, cruising.
Yacht Mischief, cruising.

Fishing Fleet Movements.

Sch. Arthur D. Story arrived at Shelburne on Friday.
Schs. Independence II., Lucinda I. Lowell and Preceptor were at Canso on Saturday and cleared for fishing.
Sch. Richard J. Nunan arrived at Lunenburg on Saturday.
Sch. Evelyn L. Thompson arrived at Liverpool, N. S., on Friday.
Sch. J. V. Flaherty arrived at Canso on Friday and schs. Manhasset and Lucinda I. Lowell sailed from there on Saturday.
Sch. Priscilla Smith arrived at Louisburg, C. B. with 90,000 pounds of fish.

Codfish Sales.

The fare of salt and fresh cod of sch. Lucania was taken by Sylvanus Smith & Co.
The fares of schs. Onato and Rob Roy were sold to the Gorton-Pew Fisheries Company.
The fare of salt cod of sch. Harvard was sold to William H. Jordan & Co.
The fare of fresh mixed fish of sch. Alice was sold to Cunningham & Thompson Company.
The fare of flitched halibut of sch. Admiral Dewey will probably be taken by Addison Wonsen.

Sept. 12.

106 1/5

TEXT OF HAGUE DECISION MORE FAVORABLE TO AMERICA.

England May Make Only Regulations Subject to Treaty Rights.

Limitation of Line of Bays to Ten Miles Recommended.

The full text of the decision of the fisheries tribunal at the Hague has been published, and appears decidedly more favorable to the United States than did the summary which was first sent out by the press correspondent.

Especially is this true in regard to questions one and five, which were decided in favor of the British contention, according to the early reports, but which are materially modified by the conditions imposed which did not appear in the summary of the decision first published.

Regarding question one, while the decision stated that the right to make rules governing the fisheries is inherent in the sovereignty of Great Britain, such rules must not be in violation of the treaty obligations and must be so framed as not to give the British fishermen an unfair advantage over the American fishermen, and in case the United States deems such regulations unreasonable, they shall be submitted to an impartial authority for a decision.

The decision in regard to question five, relating to the three mile limit in case of bays, is also accompanied with a recommendation that the rule shall not apply in cases where the bays are ten miles or more wide at the mouth until the width shall have become narrowed down to the width of ten miles. While such recommendations do not have the force of a decision, it is more than probable that the countries will adopt the recommendations.

Full Text of the Decision.

The complete report of the findings is as follows:

Question one—To what extent are the following contentions or either of them justified?

It is contended on the part of Great Britain that the exercise of the liberty to take fish, referred to in the treaty (of 1818), which the inhabitants of the United States have forever in common with the subjects of his Britannic majesty, is subject to the consent of Newfoundland in the form of municipal laws, ordinances or rules, as for example, the regulation in respect of (1) the hours, days or seasons when fish may be taken on the treaty coasts, (2) The methods, means and implements to be used in the taking of fish or in the carrying on of fishing operations on such coast, (3) Any matters of similar character relating to fishing, such regulations being reasonable.

It is contended on the part of the United States that the exercise of such liberty is not subject to limitations or restraint by Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland, unless they are appropriate and necessary for the protection and preservation of the common rights in such fisheries, and unless they be reasonable in themselves and fair as between local fishermen and fishermen coming from the United States, and not so framed as to give an advantage to the former over the latter, and unless then appropriateness, necessity, reasonableness and fairness be determined by the United States and Great Britain by common concord, and the United States concurs in their enforcement.

England May Make Regulations Subject to Treaty Rights.

Answer.—The right of Great Britain to make regulations without the consent of the United States as to the exercise of the liberty to take fish, referred to in Article 1 of the treaty of October 20, 1818, in the form of municipal laws, ordinances or rules of Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland is inherent in the sovereignty of Great Britain.

The exercise of that right by Great Britain is however, limited by the said treaty in respect to the said liberties therein granted to the inhabitants of the United States in that such regulations must be made bona fide and must not be in violation of the said treaty regulations which are (1) appropriate or necessary for the protection and preservation of such fisheries, or (2) desirable or necessary on

grounds of public order or morals, without unnecessarily interfering with the fisheries itself, and in both cases equitable and fair as between local and American fishermen, and not so framed as to give unfairly an advantage to the former over the latter class, are not inconsistent with the obligation to execute the treaty in good faith, and are, therefore, reasonable and not in violation of the treaty.

Any Questions of Reasonable Regulations Decided by Commission.

For the decision of the question whether a regulation is or is not reasonable, as being or not being in accordance with the dispositions of the treaty and not in violation thereof, the treaty of 1818 contains no special provision. The settlement of differences in this respect that might arise thereafter was left to the ordinary means of diplomatic intercourse. By reason, however, of the form in which Question one is put, and by further reason of the administration of Great Britain, by her counsel before this tribunal, that is not now for either of the parties to the treaty to determine the reasonableness of any regulations made by Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland, the reasonableness of any such regulation, if contested, must be decided, not by either of the parties, but by impartial authority in accordance with the principles herein above laid down, and in the manner proposed in the recommendations made by the tribunal.

In virtue of Article 4 of the agreement, the tribunal further decides that Article 4 of the agreement is, as stated by counsel of the respective parties at the argument, permanent in its effect and not terminable by the expiration of the general arbitration treaty of 1818 between Great Britain and the United States.

Employment of Foreign Crews on American Vessels.

Question Two—Have the inhabitants of the United States a right to employ as members of the fishing crews of their vessels persons not inhabitants of the United States?

Answer.—In view of the preceding considerations, this tribunal is of the opinion that the inhabitants of the United States, while exercising the liberties referred to in the said articles, have a right to employ as members of the fishing crews of their vessels persons not inhabitants of the United States; but, in view of the preceding considerations, the tribunal

to prevent any misunderstanding as to the effect of its award, expresses the opinion that non-inhabitants employed as members of the fishing crews on United States vessels derive no benefit or immunity from the treaty, and it is so decided and awarded.

Fishermen Not Required to Report to Customs Officers.

Question Three—Can the exercise by the inhabitants of the United States of the liberties referred to be subjected without the consent of the United States to the requirements of entry or report at custom houses or the payment of light or harbor or other dues, or any other similar requirement or condition or exaction?

Answer.—The requirement that an American fishing vessel should report, if proper conveniences for so doing are at hand, is not unreasonable, for the reasons stated in the foregoing opinion. There should be no such requirement, however, unless there be reasonably convenient opportunity afforded to report, in person or by telegraph, either at a custom house or to a customs official; but the exercise of the fishing liberty by the inhabitants of the United States should not be subjected to the purely commercial formalities of a report of entry and clearance at a custom house, nor to light, harbor or other duties not imposed upon Newfoundland fishermen.

No Restrictions Must Be Imposed on Fishermen Seeking Shelter.

Question Four—Under the provision

of the said article that the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter certain bays or harbors for shelter, repairs, wood or water, and for no other purpose whatever, but that they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatever abusing the privilege, thereby reserved to them, is it permissible to impose restrictions conditional upon the payment of light or harbor or other dues, or entering or reporting at custom houses or any similar conditions?

Answer.—It is decided and awarded that such restrictions are not permissible unless American fishermen entering such bays for any of the four purposes aforesaid and remaining more than forty-eight hours therein should be required, if thought necessary by Great Britain or the colonial government, to report either in person or by telegraph at a custom house or to a customs official, if reasonably convenient opportunity therefor is afforded, and it is so decided and awarded.

Ten Mile Width on Bays Recommended

Question Five—From where must be measured the three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors referred to in the said article?

Answer.—The tribunal decides and awards that in case of bays the three marine miles are to be measured from a straight line drawn across the body of water at the place where it ceases to have configuration and characteristics of a bay. At all other places the three marine miles are to be measured following the sinuosities of the coast.

Now this tribunal hereby recommends for the consideration and acceptance of the following rules and methods of procedure for determining the limits of the bays hereinbefore enumerated:

(1) In every bay not hereinafter specifically provided for the limits of exclusion shall be drawn three miles seaward from a straight line across the bay in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten miles. (2) In the following bays where the configuration or the coast and the local climate conditions are such that foreign fishermen when within the geographic headlands might reasonably and bona fide believe themselves on the high seas, the limits of exclusion shall be drawn in each case between the headlands hereinafter specified as being those at and within which such fishermen might be reasonably expected to recognize the bay under average conditions.

Limits of Exclusion in Specified Waters.

For the Baie des Chaleurs the line from the light at Birch Point on Miscou Island to Macquereau Point light; for the Bay of Miramichi, the line from the light at Point Escuminac to the light on the eastern point of Tab-

usintac Gully; for Egmont Bay, in Prince Edward Island, the line from the light at Cape Egmont to the light at West Point, and off St. Anne Bay, in the Province of Nova Scotia, the line from the light at Point Anconi to the nearest point on the opposite shore of the mainland.

For Fortune Bay, in Newfoundland, the line from Connaigre Head to the light on the southeasterly end of Brunet Island, thence to Fortune Head; for or near the following bays the limits of exclusion shall be three marine miles seaward from the following lines, namely:

For or near Barrington Bay, in Nova Scotia, the line from the light on Stoddart Island to the light on the south point of Cape Sable, thence to the light at Baccaro Point, at Chedabucto and St. Peter's Bay; the line from Cranberry Island light to Green Island light, thence to Point Rouge for Mira Bay; the line from the light on the east point of Scattarie Island to the northeasterly point of Cape Morien, and at Placentia Bay, in Newfoundland, the line between the Latine Point on the eastern mainland to the most southerly point of Red Island, thence by the most southerly point of Merasheen Island to the mainland.

Long Island and Bryer Island, on St. Mary's Bay, in Nova Scotia, shall for the purpose of delimitation, be taken as the coasts of such bays.

Bay of Fundy and Gut of Canso Excluded.

It is understood that nothing in these rules refers either to the Bay of Fundy, considered as a whole apart from its bays and creeks, or as to the Innocent Passages through the Gut of Canso, which were excluded by the agreement made by exchange of notes between Mr. Bacon and Mr. Bryce, dated February 21, 1909, and March 4, 1909, or to Conception Bay, which was provided for by the decision of the Privy Council in the case of the Direct United States Cable Company agt. the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, in which decision the United States have acquiesced.

Americans Entitled to Fish in Newfoundland Bays and Harbors.

Question Six.—Have the inhabitants of the United States the liberty to take fish in the bays, harbors and creeks on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Race to Rameau Islands, or on the western and northern coasts of Newfoundland from Cape Race to Quirpon Island, or on the Magdalen Islands?

Answer.—This tribunal is of opinion that American inhabitants are entitled to fish in the bays, creeks and harbors of Newfoundland and the Magdalen Islands, and it is so decided and awarded.

Fishing Vessels Entitled to Exercise Commercial Rights.

Question Seven.—Are the inhabitants of the United States, whose vessels resort to the treaty coasts, entitled to have, for those vessels, when duly authorized by the United States on that behalf, the commercial privileges on treaty coast accorded by agreement or otherwise to United States trading vessels generally?

Answer.—For these reasons this tribunal is of the opinion that the inhabitants of the United States are so entitled in so far as concerns this treaty there being nothing in its provisions to disentitle them, provided the treaty liberty of fishing and the commercial privileges are not exercised concurrently, and it is so decided and awarded.

The decision is signed by the whole tribunal, but notice of dissent from the majority report is filed by Louis M. Drago with respect to Question Five.

FIGURED PROMINENTLY.

Work of Counsel Elder and Expert Millett Praised.

The Boston Globe correspondent, writing of the work of the Hague tribunal on the fishery question, which was submitted to it has the following with regard to the two men who took a prominent part on the side of the United States:

"Two Massachusetts men figured prominently in the case, Hon. Samuel J. Elder of Winchester and Arthur Millett of Gloucester. The former made one of the notable arguments in the case, interspersing his remarks with a number of his famous stories, which were greatly enjoyed by the court and by the counsel of both countries.

"Arthur Millett's services to his country were invaluable because of his practical knowledge, frequently given to the court, of the local conditions in the north Atlantic fisheries. A series of 6 maps drawn by him also proved of the greatest value and, indeed, absolutely necessary to the United States."

MORE PRESS COMMENTS.

More Controversy Probable.

The tribunal at The Hague has given its verdict in the North Atlantic fisheries dispute with gratifying promptness, a circumstance which reflects credit not only upon the tribunal itself but also upon the counsel on both sides for the convincing clarity of their presentations and arguments in the case. As for the general character of the verdict, it was in a sense forecast by one of the American counsel, Senator Root, who got here from The Hague by steamer only a day before the cabled announcement of the result, when he said that "such decisions are always compromises." We are glad to believe, however, that this one is a compromise in only the high-

est and best meaning of the term. It is a compromise in so far as that some of the points involved are decided in favor of one and some in favor of the other party, but we do not suppose that on any of them the tribunal pronounced a verdict other than in strict accord with legal and equitable conviction.

The verdict on the fifth question is less conclusive, and, indeed, seems to open the way for much controversy in the future over other cases which have it in common with this one. It relates to the point from which "three marine miles" are to be measured in determining the boundary between the high seas and the territorial waters of bays and other inlets. The American contention was that the three-mile line should follow the windings of the shore in and out of all inlets having a radius of three miles or more, while the British contention was that it should run straight across from headland to headland. That is a question upon which any nation would be likely to take whichever side seemed to favor its own interests, and on which it may be that each of the present litigants has hitherto been inclined to take the other side from that which it took in this case. The decision now is in favor of the British contention, and thus will debar Americans from various bays and estuaries. That is cause for regret, but not, of course, for condemning the verdict. It is of interest to observe, however, that this was the only point upon which the tribunal was not unanimous, and that upon it so high an authority as Dr. Drago dissented and upheld the American contention.

There is cause therefore for rejoicing and satisfaction from a national point of view. Still greater is the cause for gratitude over this expeditious and wholly amicable disposition of a matter which for three generations had been a source of actual irritation and annoyance and even a potential source of greater evils than those. The achievement demonstrates the practical value of the arbitral and judicial machinery at The Hague for dealing with a certain class of international differences, and also the admirable spirit of mutual friendship and confidence which animates the two parties and which alone made possible such reference and such settlement of the case. A notable example is thus set for the disposal of other controversies among the nations of the world.—New York Tribune.

Sophistry Can't Obscure Facts.

While many important documents, parts of the decision of The Hague tribunal are but briefly synopsisized in despatches, enough of the text is published amply to confirm the first impression that the arbitrators rejected two historical contentions of the United States along which its case has been conducted, and decreed to us five "consolation" prizes, whose exact value it is for practice to demonstrate. No amount of cheerful sophistry can obscure the facts of the decision. Great Britain, the Dominion and Newfoundland have good reason to be satisfied. The moral effect of a victory after a diplomatic duel of half a century's duration is with them, as our State Department admits by deploring the verdict. There is still work left for the experts, the

tribunal remanding to a special commission the definition of what constitutes "reasonable" local regulation applicable to our fishermen in the waters covered by the adjudication. There may even be the possibility of arbitration on this point to come, for the tribunal has clearly borne in mind that Great Britain, to reduce a friction rapidly becoming dangerous, has been compelled more than once to moderate the zeal of Colonial legislators to make the most of their proximity to the fishing grounds.

While the colonists, the Canadians and the Newfoundlanders may have cause for immediate satisfaction in the decision, it probably will not escape their attention that the finding alone has more than present significance. The case of Great Britain not merely reveals but exhibits a practical recognition of the imperial federation idea which twenty years ago our publicists would have had no reason to anticipate. When the treaty of 1818 was negotiated, the conception of the colonies as parties having

even the privilege of intervening in interpretation of its provisions does not appear to have entered the heads of the negotiators of either side. The treaty was between high sovereignties, and the obligation of colonies and dependencies was to avoid conflict with it. Such has been our interpretation from the first, but Great Britain, partly by evasion, has edged on each period of controversy nearer to an assertion of the position it boldly avowed before the tribunal, that local regulations of a British foreign colony need not be submitted to any foreign Power with which Great Britain has a treaty on a similar subject. The unity of the British empire expressed in imperial assertion of colonial interests was the key point of the British case at The Hague, and the decision, though specifically directed to a particular controversy, has a wide bearing on the future relations of colonial powers to other nations.

Because we lost on two great points at The Hague it is not for us to wail and knock our breasts or declare arbitration is a failure. The direct effect of the decision on our fishing interests may be so small as, commercially speaking, to be almost imperceptible; but as Americans, we are pardonable if we do not receive with equanimity the assurance of an impartial tribunal that a long succession of American publicists have been in the wrong on a question which concerns far more than "a few miserable fish."—Boston Transcript.

Bring Out the Sporting Instinct.

The Hague arbitration court has decided against the United States on the two points regarded as most important in the fisheries discussion. Now let us see if American fishermen are good sports, and whether they will abide by the decision or try to get round it.—Boston Globe.

It Belongs To Him.

It's long odds that Samuel J. Elder can get a codfish or two whenever he hankers after one, from the fishermen themselves, free for nothing.—Boston Globe.